

NEW TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

"Put yourselves in array against Babylon round about: all ye that bend the bow, shoot at her, spare no arrows; for she hath sinned against the Lord."—Jer. l. 14.

THE POPE'S SUPREMACY AND "THE ROCK."*

"And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—MATT. xvi. 18.

"For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."—1 COR. iii. 11.

"And (ye) are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone."—EPH. ii. 20.

"To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious, ye also, as lively (Gr. *living*) stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."—1 PETER ii. 4, 5.

INTRODUCTION.—A simple inspection of the passages above quoted, in juxtaposition and in scriptural order, exhibits the *metaphorical* character of the four texts, the *homogeneity* of the imagery, and (as we shall see more conclusively in the sequel) the *common object* to which these texts refer—namely, the Church of Christ. As the question of this Tract hangs upon the correct interpretation of these figurative passages, and more especially upon the figurative proposition:—

"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church," the treatment of the subject will need some preliminary remarks upon the nature and scriptural usage of the literary emblems in which the Divine Spirit thus clothes and yet reveals the mysteries of heaven, and also calls attention to the fact. "I have used *similitudes*, by the ministry of the prophets." (Hosea xii. 10.) "I will open my mouth in *parables*." (Matt. xiii. 35.) As these similitudes and parables belong to the order of figures which rhetoric calls metaphor, and must be subject to the ordinary laws of that figure, these introductory remarks include a few on:—

METAPHORICAL FIGURES.—A metaphor is a figure founded on a resemblance existing, and a comparison instituted, between two objects

* The substance of some parts of this Tract has already appeared in print in one of the writer's controversial Essays (1855).

—the *type* and the *antitype*, or the image and the ideas represented by the image. The type and the antitype are always *similar* in some respects, and *dissimilar* in others, and the more points of resemblance the more perfect the figure. Thus, when Christ, for His moral courage, is called “The Lion of the tribe of Judah,” this trait of courage is almost the only point of resemblance between the objects compared. When He is called “The Shepherd of Israel,” the marks of similitude between the office of Christ to His Church, and that of a shepherd to his flock, being much more numerous and significant, the figure is proportionably more perfect.

The more independent and defined of the parts composing the type are distinguished as the *members of the figure*. Thus, when Christ says, “I am the vine, ye are the branches,” the “vine,” or the stock of the vine, which is indicated, constitutes one member, the “branches,” the other member of the figure.

INTERPRETATION OF FIGURES.—To interpret a metaphor, or, as it is sometimes called in reference to Scripture similitudes, to *spiritualise* it, is to refer the members of the type to the corresponding parts of the antitype. For conciseness this is commonly done by merely *asserting the identity* of the objects compared (although, of course, they are not identical but similar). Thus, Christ, in explaining the parable of the sower, says, “He that soweth the good seed *is* the Son of man; the field *is* the world, the good seed *are* the children of the kingdom,” etc.

As the type and the antitype are only similar in some respects, care must be taken not to stretch the comparison beyond what is *obvious* in the way of resemblance, else we involve contradictions instead of similitudes. When, for example, a man is compared to a tree, and his works to its fruits, the fruits will not symbolise the works in *every respect*. Thus, a tree has naturally but one class of fruit, while the moral and immoral acts of men are various in kind or quality. The figure cannot be strained to represent this variety in virtuous and vicious conduct without instituting comparisons between things devoid of at least any *obvious* resemblance, which is a necessary quality of a judicious metaphor.

CONSISTENCY OF INTERPRETATION.—*Similar* things in the type must not be compared with *dissimilar* things in the antitype. Thus, in the much-abused figure, “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church,” the rock and the superstructure are similar things, both being material objects with material affinities. Hence, if the interpretation is to supply an antitype in harmony with this affinity of parts in the type, and if in the antitype that which corresponds to the material superstructure is a *personal* community, the Church, or body of believers, then this personal superstructure must have a *personal* foundation; that is, the rock must represent a *personal object*. Many, however, of what the Church of Rome calls “the Fathers,” explain the typical rock here built upon to signify “Peter’s confession;” not the *object* confessed, but the

doctrine confessed, or the *doctrine about the object* confessed—namely, the Divine mission and sonship of Christ. By this interpretation the personal superstructure (which, in the type, would be a structure of stones, or, as Peter calls them in the passage quoted, “living stones”), instead of being raised on a *personal*, is built upon a *doctrinal* basis—a basis which not only violates the consistency of the imagery, but totally eliminates the true signification of the type. This signification will be made more obvious when it comes to be shown that the leading design of this figure, like that of the figurative vine already referred to, is to symbolise that *union of believers* with Christ, and through Him with one another, which divines call the “mystical union,” and the Apostles’ Creed, the “communion of saints.” Christ says, “I (not my *doctrine*, but my *person*) am the vine; ye are the branches.” As both the vine and the branches are *personal* emblems in the one figure, both the rock and the stones are personal emblems in the other, which symbolises the same union effected by the same Spirit (the cement and bond of the building); and the proposition, “I am the vine, ye are the branches,” is not more true in relation to the expression of this union than the parallel one—I am the rock, ye are the stones.

Those who first proposed to build the personal superstructure here called “the Church” upon the airy abstraction of a doctrine, had no correct conception of the profound personal relations which is figuratively implied by this noble type.

SEPARATED MEMBERS OF FIGURES.—Scripture metaphors seldom appear in their integrity in the same passage, different constituents, properly pertaining to the same figure, being usually found in a *passim* manner in different texts. Certain features of a thought occupy the mind of the writer or speaker, to the exclusion of associated ideas, and he appropriates so much of some complete image as may be necessary to illustrate the idea before the mind. In such cases, in order to obtain a view of the whole type and its antitype, we must compare the passages, and so associate the separated members of the figure as to see it in its integrity of structure and signification. Christ says, “The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered (fishes) of every kind.” (Matt. xiii. 47.) Here we have a net spoken of, the casting of the net, the sea, the gathering of the fishes, etc.; but no mention is made of the *fishermen* who cast the net. This dislocated member of the figure has to be gleaned from another passage, in which Christ, speaking to certain of the apostles who were fishermen, said, “Follow me, and I will make you FISHERS of men.” (Matt. iv. 19.) Hence the simile, completed by bringing together its separated parts, would be this—“The kingdom of heaven is like unto *fishermen* casting a net into the sea, and gathering,” etc.; and following the mode of interpretation exemplified in the parable of the sower, this would be the interpretation:—The fishermen are the gospel ministry; the net is the gospel instrumentality or means of grace; the sea is the world;

and the fishes gathered are those brought into the Church, or within the pale of gospel responsibility—"some good, some bad."

Take, as another example, that in which the Church is symbolised by the human body in its head and members. In some passages the *body*, exclusive of the head, is spoken of. "There is one BODY and one Spirit." (Eph. iv. 4.) Elsewhere the body is distributed into *members*. "So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one MEMBERS one of another." (Rom. xii. 5.) Elsewhere, again, the members are distinguished in their *offices*. "For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? if the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling," etc. (1 Cor. xii. 14-21.) Elsewhere we are shown, in passage upon passage, that Christ, and Christ *alone*, is the Head of this mystical body. "And he is the HEAD of the body, the church." (Col. i. 18.) "And not holding the HEAD, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." (Col. ii. 19.) In the natural body the head is the central organ which originates the structure and functions of the members, the seat of intellect and will, the governing power which evolves thought, volition, and motion for every member throughout. Such also is Christ in His analogical relations to that mystical body of which He is the Head, and which His spirit inhabits and pervades, as the human spirit is domiciled and diffused throughout the natural organism.

In comparing figurative passages we must be careful not to mingle or identify the imagery of *different figures*. The genuine fragments of a Scripture type are like those of a potter's fractured vessel, as easily seen to be parts of the same unit, and as easily found to unite with congruity, when we desire to combine them.

In the application of the foregoing introductory remarks to an exposition of the figurative edifice contained in the first of our texts, Matt. xvi. 18, the three members of the type will form the separate topics of further observations; that is to say, the *Builder*, the *Church*, and the *Foundation* of the edifice, are here consecutively reviewed in relation to Rome's claims on this passage.

General View of the Builder, the Church, and the Foundation, according to the Gospel.

The usual plan of conducting disputation is to seek to overthrow error first, and then to exhibit truth, *if we try to exhibit it at all*. The plan is, doubtless, good in many cases. But as it has so long and largely failed with Romanists, the subjoined observations, bearing on the contested text of this Tract, are designed to reverse this process. A sage has said that the victims of unmitigated ignorance cannot be convinced that they are so, because it requires a consider-

able amount of knowledge to know that we are ignorant. May we not deduce from this fact, that we can only effectually convince any individual of his error by enlightening him in the *opposite truth*; and may it not be a general truism, that all the mental errors in the world exist, and exist solely, because *the opposite truths* have never been made sufficiently clear to the holders of error? At least, some degree of this conviction has led us to try and present "the opposite truth" in the present case, before proceeding more exclusively to examine the *opposite error*.

The Builder.—The whole work of Christ in the construction of the spiritual temple called "The Church," is comprehended in two very distinct forms of operation—the *Objective* and the *Subjective*; which mean, respectively, the work done *for* believers, and the work done *in* them. Each of these works is accomplished in the execution of three equally distinct offices, those of a *Priest*, of a *Prophet*, and of a *King*.

THE OBJECTIVE WORK AND OFFICES OF CHRIST.

By the objective execution of His *priestly* office, Christ died on the material cross; by the same external execution of His *prophetic* office, He inspired and delivered the Sacred Scriptures (for "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy"—Rev. xix. 10), and He is called, for this reason, "The WORD of God" (Rev. xix. 13); and by the same exercise of His *kingly* office, the agencies of His providence control and regulate the course of all events, with special relation to the interests of His Church, and of each of its members individually considered. He is not only Head over the Church, but "Head over ALL THINGS to (or for) the Church." (Eph. i. 22.)

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.—Among the many departments of this objective work, and as auxiliary to the erection of His Church, is the institution of a community and economy scripturally called "The kingdom of heaven."* This kingdom, like every other, includes all who are properly subject to its laws; and, like other kingdoms, the laws become binding by their simple proclamation or due publicity. These laws are the provisions and obligations of the Gospel; and as that which makes any individual the subject of a kingdom, is not the fact that he accepts or obeys the laws, but the fact that he is within the rightful jurisdiction of the sovereign, and that the laws have been duly published; so that which makes any individual a subject of the kingdom of heaven, is not the fact that he accepts the Gospel, but the fact that *he hears it, and has been offered it*. Hence, too, as every subject is judged by the laws of the kingdom to which he belongs, he who is thus brought within the pale of this kingdom, by the Gospel proclamation, will be judged by its laws at the judgment-seat of Christ. "The words that I have spoken, the same shall

* This must not be confounded with "the kingdom of God," which has *always* the *subjective* meaning; while the phrase "kingdom of heaven," is used specially, though not exclusively, in the *objective* sense.

JUDGE him in the last day." (John xii. 48.) The kingdom thus constituted, therefore, includes several distinct classes; as those who, like the parties addressed above by Christ, hear the Gospel, but *reject it*, even in profession; those who embrace it by *mere profession*; and those who embrace it *savingly*. The parable of the sower, the most comprehensive exponent of this kingdom, enumerates the several classes, and ultimately reduces them to two—the *righteous* and the *wicked*. (Matt. xiii. 36–38.)

THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST.—A second Gospel provision established by the objective agency of Christ, but through the instrumentality of His Apostles, is the order of institutions called "The Churches of Christ," (Rom. xvi. 16,) because they *profess* to receive Christ in His offices and doctrine. These societies were severally constituted, subject to human rulership (whether the power to rule is inherent in the officials, independent of the membership, or not); and as human rulers cannot discern the human heart, they are obliged to make the *profession* of faith, and not the *possession* of faith, the term of fellowship. This profession being a visible act, made by baptism or otherwise, such Churches are *visible* Churches, and their members *visible* members. *True* Christians are, of course, visible members of such Churches; but visible simply as *professing* Christians, and not as *true* Christians. "The Lord (not man) knoweth them that are his." (2 Tim. ii. 19.) A "Church of Christ" being organised so as to embrace official teaching and discipline, those who become and remain members of such a Church are bound to respect its discipline in relation to moral conduct, and other matters embraced in its rules,—a duty which the Scripture enforces, when it counsels the members of such a society who cannot otherwise settle their differences between them, to "tell them to the church," and to "hear the church." (Matt. xviii. 17.) See also 1 Cor. vi. 1–7.

THE SUBJECTIVE WORK AND OFFICES OF CHRIST.

The *subjective* agency of Christ, or that by which His offices are exercised *within* believers, is another and a very different work from the preceding. Through this exercise of His *priestly* office, His sacrifice is appropriated by the believer, and offered to God by faith, in such a way that the believer himself becomes a priest, made like Christ, "after the order of Melchisedec." (Heb. v. 6.) In this order Christ Himself is declared to be the "*High Priest*" (Heb. vi. 20); and His high priesthood is exclusive and unchangeable. "This man, because he continueth ever, hath an UNCHANGEABLE priesthood;" or, as the margin of the Bible has it, "a priesthood which PASSETH NOT FROM ONE TO ANOTHER." (Heb. vii. 24.) But the title and office of *high priest*, necessarily imply a *subordinate* priesthood of the same order; and accordingly, the subordinate priesthood (and the *only* subordinate priesthood) associated in the order with Christ is the *general priesthood of believers*, who, as by the hand of Christ Himself, present the same sacrifice for the same objects. For this reason

they are called by Peter, "An holy priesthood, (consecrated) to offer up spiritual sacrifices to God BY JESUS CHRIST" (1 Pet. ii. 5); and their calling and privileges are secured, like those of Christ Himself, by a *Divine oath*. (Heb. vi. 13-20, and vii. 21.)

The appointment of such a priesthood, of course, requires a passing reference to Rome, whose priesthood must be another and a distinct order. There are but three orders of priesthood made mention of, or reference to, in the New Testament,—the order of Aaron, the order of Melchisedec, and the heathen order of Jupiter (Acts xiv. 13), of which the "*Pontifex Maximus*" of Rome was the reputed high priest when the Christian religion was being established. As the priests of the Church of Rome *do not* profess to belong to the order of Aaron, and as they *cannot* profess to belong to the order of Melchisedec, or an order which the Scriptures make common to the whole body of believers in the Church, it follows, from the necessity of the case, that if they belong to any order referred to in the New Testament, it must be the *heathen order* of Rome, the title of whose high priest the Pope, as we know, succeeds to, or assumes.

Next, by the subjective exercise of Christ's *prophetic* office, this priesthood of believers are savingly illuminated in a knowledge of the Divine Word, and not merely as disciples, but as *preceptors* or *teachers*. As in the case of the priesthood, Christ inducts them with Himself into the prophetic office, or constitutes His people prophets (not *prophesiers*, the word prophet, in its proper signification, meaning a preceptor or teacher). The inspired prayer of Moses, when he said, "Would God all the Lord's people were prophets" (Num. xi. 29), Christ answers or fulfils, and He anoints them into office with such power, that he who has this "unction from the Holy One . . . need not that any man teach him." (1 John ii. 20, 27.) Nevertheless the majority of believers so live beneath or neglect to cultivate this office, that now, as in the apostle's days, it can be said, "When for the time ye ought to be TEACHERS, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God." (Heb. v. 12.)

Lastly, by the subjective exercise of His *kingly* office, Christ reigns in the *hearts* of this priesthood. (Eph. iii. 17.) When they have become "willing in the day of his power," (Psa. cx. 3,) He is not content to be considered as reigning alone. The power He exercises over their naturally ill-regulated hearts He accredits to His people—imputes to them the *royal* dignity of self-government, and thus, as in the other offices, He raises them to the kingly with Himself. Hence, Peter not only calls them "an holy priesthood," but a "ROYAL Priesthood" (1 Pet. ii. 9), and John dignifies them with the double title of "KINGS and Priests." (Rev. i. 6.)

The first determinate act of the "Builder," in the execution of this subjective work, is to *unite the believer to himself* by the gift of the Spirit on the part of Christ, and the exercise of faith on the part of the believer; and the same two bonds which thus unite believers to

Christ, necessarily unite them to one another. This union produces as the result "The Church," of which Christ is the exclusive builder and base—"In whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord." (Eph. ii. 21.)

The Church.—No term or object in the Scriptures has caused so much conflict, both of word and opinion, as the term Church, while no term in Scripture, or out of it, has a greater simplicity of signification. Like every other term, this must designate either an object of which there is a *plurality*, or an object of which there is but *one*. It has the first sense when applied to signify one of the Churches scripturally called "The Churches of Christ" (Rom. xvi. 16); as the "church which is at Corinth;" the "church of the Thessalonians;" the "church of Ephesus;" the "church in Nymphas' house," etc. It has the second sense when intended to represent that assembly, which is necessarily one, to the exclusion of all similar—namely, the *assembly of the saved*; as, "The Lord added to the church daily such as should be SAVED." (Acts ii. 47.) "The church of God, which he hath PURCHASED with his own blood" (Acts xx. 28); "Christ is the head of the church; and he is the SAVIOUR OF THE BODY." (Eph. v. 23.) There may be passages of Scripture in which it is difficult to decide *which* of these meanings the term has; but this does not affect the rule that it has *one* or *other* of these significations in every New Testament passage in which it is applied to a Christian community.

A *third* sense has to be noticed. The "Churches of Christ," as we have seen, are so many *visible* Churches. With, perhaps, a laudable but mistaken purpose to promote unity of sentiment among Christians, the *aggregate* of these Churches early came to be viewed and represented as *one* "visible Church." This visible Church, because of its collective and general character, then came to be called the "Catholic Church," and subsequently and simply "*The Church*." Thus the term church became the verbal representative of *another* universal Church of Christ, totally distinct from the universal assembly of the saved, to which the Scriptures strictly confine it; and this insidious forgery has produced more ills to Christianity than the combined heresies of all time. The word church, in its new sense, was employed at the first simply as a conventional and historical term; but the Papacy early began to force the new sense into Scripture passages; propounding the notion that such a Church was to be found *there*, and that the "Mother Church of Rome," with her affiliated dependents, was *that Church*. The result was, that by thus applying the specious terms, "The Catholic Church," and "The Church," to the aggregate of the visible Churches—that is, to the aggregate of *professors* instead of the aggregate of the *saved*,—the one sense became the established *substitute* for the other, and the whole vocabulary of names, titles, attributes, privileges, promises, prophecies, etc., which the Scriptures so guardedly restrict to the Church of the saved, were usurped by, and self-applied to, this

“Catholic Church”—that is, to a vast visible community, practically exhibiting at the time, and ever since, unlimited profligacy, fanaticism, and tyranny.

That this universal visible Church has no place in the Scripture records is easily proved. First, it cannot be identified, as Rome tries to identify it, with the Scripture community called “The kingdom of heaven;” for, as we have seen, this kingdom includes a large proportion of *non*-professors of Christianity as well as professors; whereas the “Catholic Church” avowedly includes *only* professors. Second, much less can it be identified with the term Church, as scripturally applied to the assembly of the saved, for the so-called Catholic Church confessedly includes a multitude of the *unsaved*. Third, it cannot be identified with the aggregate of the visible Churches scripturally called “The Churches of Christ,” for the Apostles never established or organised such an aggregate Church, and *therefore* the Scriptures never *name* such an aggregate. The “Churches of Christ” were united by the bonds of a common *faith*, not of a common *government*; much less by the rigours of a procrustean and compulsory canon law, enforced by a scale of penitential mulets, and by a religious bastille called the Inquisition. The Apostles formed *no bond of governmental union* among the Scripture Churches, for the wise objects of salutary emulation, the security of Christian liberty, and the preservation of worldly peace. The Papacy, by amalgamating what the Apostles left separate, converted these Churches into a collective sink of inactivity and corruption; set up a huge sacerdotal tyranny over religious liberty, and aiming to rival the civil powers in the government of their own subjects, embroiled the world in the most bloody hostilities, organised the most ferocious aggressions against human life, and called such aggressions by the pious turn of phrase—“holy wars.”

The Foundation.—Christ is not only the Builder, but the Foundation of His Church. He builds His Church on Himself—not on His humanity, but on His divinity. Even the perfect manhood of Christ, much less the crazy humanity of Peter, could not sustain the pressure of this edifice. But while “the rock,” as we shall more explicitly see in a future page, thus represents Christ in His Divine nature and Kingly office, it yet denotes Him in a *special function* of that nature and office. The functions of sovereignty are twofold—to *support* and *govern*. By the first, the sovereign power is the source of *safety* to the commonwealth—the bond which preserves and upholds the constitution of the State. By the second, the same power is the source of *legal authority*—the power which demands the obedience, and regulates the duty of the subject. The metaphorical rock symbolises the sovereignty of Christ in the first of these aspects, or Christ in His sustaining and preserving relations to the spiritual community called the Church. Here we should be careful to note that *support*, on the part of the foundation, implies *dependence* on the part of the superstructure. The metaphor is hence designed to imply, that

as the safety of a material building depends upon the solidity of its foundation, the safety or salvation of believers (the two words are substantially equivalent,) depends upon the analogous character of the spiritual basis. We have thus the expressive analogy between the material dependence, (or the dependence of a building on its base,) and the moral dependence we call *faith*.

Faith, accurately judged, is an *intelligent* act. It is the spiritual vision of the spiritual mind—"the EVIDENCE (that which apprehends the evidence) of things not seen." It is an *understanding* principle—"By faith we UNDERSTAND that the worlds were framed by the word of God." But this spiritual intelligence is so associated with, and inseparable from, the *feeling* we call *trust*, that ordinarily *faith* and *trust* may be regarded as mental identities.

This faith or trust, then, is like the dependence or *pressure* of the building on its base. It is the "pressure" of the mind; that resting of the soul upon Christ, which brings the *feeling of security*—which places the soul in union with, and moral dependence upon, the Rock of human safety. Hence results the necessary consequence that the rock of the Church *symbolises the object of faith in relation to the interests of salvation*. If Peter is the rock, or his "successor" the Pope, then Peter or the Pope is the object in which we are to believe—that is, in which we are to put the specific trust that realises our justification and all its associated benefits. We do not need to waste many words in referring to Scripture, to prove that we are justified by faith in Christ, and not by faith in Peter or the Pope; more especially as we are told that if we put such trust—any religious trust whatever—in Peter or the Pope, we rest our souls upon a cursed foundation—"Cursed be the man that TRUSTETH IN MAN." (Jer. xvii. 5.)

General View of the Builder, the Church, and the Foundation, according to the Romish Principles.

Romanism is both the *counterfeit* and *contrast* of Christianity. How two systems can be at once the likeness and the opposite of each other, is a paradox which needs more explanation than our space permits. Suffice it to say, that the Pope professes to be the "VICAR of Christ;" and, therefore, to be *like* Christ in relation to the Church. To vicariously represent Christ in any practical sense, is to assume His *offices*—that is, of Priest, Prophet, and King. We have already seen how these offices are executed both in their "objective" and "subjective" relations; and the expositions, supplied and sustained at every point by unanswerable Scripture testimony, sufficiently demonstrate that any attempt to represent Christ in the execution of these offices must be the most profane apery of Christ and His work. Still the Pope professes *vicariously* to execute all these offices. This vicarious principle runs throughout the entire constitution of the Church of Rome, and *simulates* Christianity; and as nothing so injuriously affects and subverts truth as its *counterfeit*, this *simulation* of Christianity is the real source and secret of

Rome's *opposition* to it. We have yet to explain more fully "how two systems can be at once the likeness and the opposite of each other." As we have said, the vicarious principle flows from the head throughout the whole constitution of the Papacy. The Church, its priesthood, sacrifice, sacraments, ordinances—all are vicarious—that is, all are *substitutionary* for the work and word of Christ. Hence as this vicarial characteristic is the very *essence* of Romanism, the true denominational title of this ism is—VICARIANISM.

As every doctrine in the Church of Rome must be either defined or sanctioned by the "Vicar of Christ," it follows that Vicarianism (*i.e.*, the doctrine of the Vicar of Christ,) is not only an appropriate, but the *only* appropriate term by which to express the doctrinal system of the Papacy. But, then, if this term, Vicar of Christ, is the precise equivalent of another employed in Scripture, namely, "Anti-christ," then the doctrine of the Vicar of Christ will also mean the *doctrine of Anti-christ*. That Vicar of Christ and Antichrist are strictly synonymous terms, will be understood by a few verbal and Scriptural expositions.

The literal and exegetical relations between the words Christ and Antichrist will be best understood by a reference to the parallel relations between the words *type* and *antitype*, which are the English forms of the Greek words *tupos* and *antitypos*. *Tupos* comes from the Greek verb *tupto*, I strike. When an impression or mark is made by a blow, the type means that which strikes or makes the impression, and the antitype the impression made by the type. Thus, the seal which *strikes* and impresses its device upon the wax is the type, the impression so made the antitype. We have also an apt and familiar instance, illustrating the correct application of these terms, in the art of printing. The metal character or stamp is called the *type*, the impression made on the printed sheet is the *antitype*. From these illustrations it is evident that the type and antitype are things closely *similar*, with, however, this essential and important difference—the type is the *original* counterpart, the antitype the *pattern* or *copy*. From some unhappy and perhaps unaccountable cause, however, this relationship between the two words has come to be all but wholly *reversed*; so that the copy is now, as a rule, called the type, the original the antitype. The Scriptures, in the Greek of the Testament, however, employ the words in their primary and correct relationship. Thus, while *we* call the Old Testament symbols of the New Testament realities *types*, the Apostle calls them *antitypes*. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures (Greek, the *antitypes*) of the true." (Heb. ix. 24.) Again, *we* call baptism the type or symbol of the new birth, while the Apostle Peter calls it the *antitype*. "The like figure (Greek, the like *antitype*) whereunto even baptism doth also now save us; not the putting away of the filth of the flesh," etc. (1 Pet. iii. 21.) We know of only a Scriptural instance or two in which the word type is used for what in the primary sense would be the antitype. But as these exceptional cases occur in incidental *speeches*, evidently not inspired (although, of course, the Scripture *reports* of them are), they have not the warrant of inspiration.

These remarks will lead us to a correct apprehension of the term "anti," which is found alike in the terms antitype and antichrist. This preposition is now almost invariably employed to denote *opposition*, instead of *apposition*, or agreement. Hence, the term antichrist is constantly defined to mean one that *opposes* Christ. But the terms Christ and Antichrist have a similar literal relation between

them as the words type and antitype. Christ is the original, or type; Antichrist the copy, or antitype; and we know that the copy, instead of conflicting with the original, must closely concord with it. Further, in practical relations, the copy not only represents the original, but often becomes the *substitute for it*. Liddell and Scott's standard Greek Lexicon, in defining "anti," gives it this substitutionary sense. It says, "The proper sense is *instead*, or *in place of*." Hence, so far as the *literature* of the word is concerned, Antichrist, instead of denoting one that acts *against* Christ, means one that acts *for him*—one that acts "instead of, or in place of," Christ. The representative or copy may be a counterfeit, an unlawful duplicate of the original. But nothing of this appears in the literal sense of the word; and but for one fatal fact the term might have been a highly *honourable* epithet. That fatal fact is, that while Antichrist represents, or professes to represent Christ, he at the same time *denies* Christ. (1 John ii. 22.) While, however, this fact necessarily imposes an additional sense upon the term antichrist, it cannot consistently expunge from the word its literal and proper sense. Hence, this name associates two ideas, or two *opposite senses*. It means one that *represents* Christ, and at the same time *denies* Him; and it is only by judging the two significations, as they qualify one another, that we obtain the adequate and true notion involved in the term. By thus collating the two senses we find that Antichrist cannot *lawfully* represent Christ, otherwise he could not *deny* Him. Again, he cannot *avowedly* deny Christ, otherwise he could not assume to represent Him; for it is evident that one who professes to represent an individual cannot at the same time *openly* repudiate and deny him. Hence, as Antichrist denies Christ, and at the same time assumes a position which implies a profession of Christ, we are shut up to one conclusion as to the *mode* in which he denies Christ; namely, he denies Christ *by usurping the authority and assuming the offices proper to Christ*. This, of itself, would be a rank and effectual denial of Christ; but the form and effect of this denial receive their consummation in the fact, that while this denier of Christ usurps His authority *he professes to render Him allegiance*. Such a profession was necessary to realise the Scripture character of Antichrist. The Scripture exhibits him not only as an arch-apostate, but also as an arch-deceiver. He comes "with all *deceivableness* of unrighteousness" (2 Thess. ii. 10), and we know that an *open* rejection and denial of Christ would be fatal to this characteristic of his mission.

It only remains to inquire, Does the Bishop of Rome assume the name, and the functions implied in the name, of Antichrist? and the answer is supplied by the name which the Pope assumes. We are told that while Christ came in His "Father's name," (one who is doubtless the) Antichrist would "come in his own name," or a name of his own choice. "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his *OWN NAME*, him ye will receive." (John v. 43.) The official name in which Jesus came—the name

of His Father's appointment—was “The Christ,” that by which Peter confessed Him in Matt. xvi. 16. The official name in which, according to prophetic foresight, His denier would come, is “the Antichrist.” (1 John ii. 18.) The article is in the original before both names. The name the Pope assumes, as exclusively proper to his official position—“his own name”—is “Vicar of Christ.” Vicar, all our lexicons define to be, “one that acts instead of, or in place of, another.” It has in it, therefore, the *precise verbal sense* which we have seen Liddell and Scott give to the term *anti*. Hence, Vicar of Christ and Antichrist are definitely synonymous terms, and he who assumes the one, and the offices implied in the one, as definitely assumes the other, and the offices implied in the other. Hence, too, as the Scripture by prophetic anticipation records this name—that is, Antichrist, or Vicar of Christ, and as the Pope has made a voluntary choice of it for “his own name,”—as he assumes not only the name, but *the offices implied in the name*, it follows, that so far as *this* prophetic evidence goes, the Pope literally and practically fulfils the Scriptural marks of Antichrist.

A weak attempt to expunge this brand from the Pope is commonly made, on the ground that Antichrist is a *singular term* standing for an *individual*, whereas the throne of the Papacy includes a long succession of rulers. It requires but a smattering of controversial logic to reciprocate this objection. Rome, on “the Rock” of the Church, thus speaks:—

“St Hierom (or Jerome) to Damasus taketh this rock not to be Peter's person only, but *his successors and his chair*.”—Rhemish Testament. Notes on Matt. xvi. 17, 18.

“The Rock,” then, a *singular term*, is scripturally put, as Rome will have it, not for a single person, but for *the whole dynasty of Popes*. Hence, while we dispute Rome's application of the principle here implied, we accept the principle itself, namely, the common Scriptural one which puts an individual or his name for a dynasty of rulers. “Infallibility” itself, therefore, provides us with the principle by which we interpret the singular term Antichrist, as the representative of a dynastic line of apostates.

The writer does not disavow a *double fulfilment* of prophecy in relation to the person and mission of Antichrist, or that there may yet be an *individual* Antichrist—a special incarnation of Satanic power and delusion “developed,” according to Dr Newman's principle, from the Papacy, and wearing the visor of Christ and the mask of falsehood with a verisimilitude more skilfully adapted to the style and attainments of modern thought, than the present grosser counterfeit, or the *locum tenens* who now sits in the chair of Antichrist.

These remarks have been made to throw additional light upon the principle of “Vicarianism,” or the substitutionary character of Popery in relation to Christianity. The Vicar of Christ transmits the principle of his office to his creed. A substitutionary Christ can only consist with a substitutionary Christianity—a counterfeit which bears the same relationship to the Gospel as the echo bears to the living

voice, when it reflects that voice not from a *living* oracle, but from the *dead* impediment which returns the peculiar mock response. The Gospel is the living voice—Vicarianism its delusionary echo.

To recommend the recognition and adoption of this *ipsissimum verbum* of the Roman system, the term, or its cognates, will be occasionally used in the sequel.

The Vicarious Builder.—Christianity and Popery, like the birth of Jacob and Esau from the one womb, take their origin from the ONE TEXT, or rather from the one proposition of the one text, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church." To make the parody complete, the Papacy holds that Peter is both the *rock* and *founder* of the Church of Rome; that like Christ, he, too, built his Church on himself. We are told, that having been constituted Vicar of Christ, both as the base and builder of the New Testament Church, he forthwith repaired to Rome, *there* laid himself as the rock, upon that rock erected the rudiments of the capacious and towering structure since called "The Catholic Church," and before his death committed the future "development" of this Church to a line of successors called "the Popes." All this story is professedly based upon Scripture *interpreted by Tradition*. But here, again, Rome exhibits a specimen of her contrastive relations to Christianity. She holds that the Gospel was first delivered by tradition, or by oral teaching, and so do we. We willingly accept tradition as well as Scripture. Our difference lies in the *mutual relations* of the two forms in which the Gospel was delivered. Rome holds that tradition, as preserved by herself, is the witness and interpreter of Scripture. We hold (because the Scripture holds) *exactly the reverse*. The written word is the test, and, therefore, the interpreter of what was spoken. The ten commandments afford an easy illustration of the case. These, every one knows, were first delivered by tradition, or in the oral form. (Exod. xx.) Were they not short and simple enough to be surely preserved by tradition? God thought not. What was spoken might be corrupted, and, at all events, might be *disputed*; what is *written* cannot. Accordingly, the "Ten words" were afterwards written on "Tables of Stone," and, because the writing was expressly intended to be a standing *witness* of what was spoken, the tables were called "The Tables of TESTIMONY." (Exod. xxxi. 18; etc.) It is precisely so with all other inspired deliverances; the *written* is the designed witness and expositor of the previously *spoken* word. The Scriptures everywhere evince this mutual relation between themselves and tradition; for in challenging proof they are nowhere found to ask, "What saith tradition" in relation to Scripture? but, "What saith the Scripture" in relation to the word previously spoken? (Rom. iv. 3.) Hence, whatever is not found thus witnessed by the Scripture record, is to be rejected as "The tradition of men." (Col. ii. 8.)

The whole story of the founding of an Episcopacy at Rome by the Apostle Peter is of this character. The written word witnesses

against it. It interprets this tradition* to be a groundless fable; and the tenor of history testifies the same. The story is simply the *first* of those base and baseless forgeries which, like the "Donation of Constantine," the "Epistle of Peter to Pepin," the "Isidorean Decretals," etc., belongs to the order of traditions usually called "Pious Frauds." Every informed Romanist admits all these forgeries except the *first*, and the first will find its place with the rest.

The Vicarious Church.—The Church of Rome claims to be the Church of Christ, and her constitution, as such, is thus set forth in her standards:—

"The Church, as the Sacred Scriptures and the writings of the holy men who have gone before us testify, includes the good and the bad, and this interpretation is sustained by the apostle when he says, 'There is one body and one Spirit.'—Eph. iv. 4.

"That the Church is composed of the good and the bad, we learn from many parables contained in the Gospels. Thus the kingdom of heaven—that is, the church militant (or the Church of Rome, a *literally* militant establishment)—is compared to a net cast into the sea (Matt. xiii. 47); to a field in which tares were sown with the good grain (Matt. xiii. 24)," etc.—"*Catechism of the Council of Trent*," (which is *no* catechism, but a compendious and good sized volume containing the most authentic expositions extant on the Council of Trent.)—Donovan's Ed. 1829, p. 95.

The fallacy here is seen to lie in confounding "The Church" with "The kingdom of heaven," while in Scripture the one bears the same relation to the other as the *family* of a sovereign bears to his *subjects*. The distinction includes this difference, that, while the family are included in the subjects, the subjects are not included in the family—a distinction which effectually precludes the *identity* of the two communities. The "kingdom of heaven" certainly includes "the good and the bad," but it is precisely *for that reason* that it is not the Church which Christ builds, otherwise a large proportion of His materials would be the heirs of destruction instead of salvation. The parable of the sower, to which the Catechism appeals, divides "the kingdom" into the righteous and the wicked, and of the latter class the Scriptures tell us that Christ will "destroy them, and *not build them up*." (Psa. xxviii. 5.)

But the Catechism says that the apostle "*sustains* the interpretation," that the righteous and the wicked are "one body and one spirit," and not one body and *two* spirits. The righteous are "one spirit" with the wicked, and the wicked "one spirit" with the righteous, and the spirit of both is the spirit given to the Church, as the bond which unites her membership—namely, the "Holy Spirit." We need not dwell, for a moment, upon a profane misrepresentation which would make the Holy Spirit the common indweller of the wicked and the righteous. Had the Council of Trent merely "*wrested* the Scriptures" to this effect, it would have been quite in keeping

* The writer believes in the tradition, that Peter was at Rome before his death, and died by crucifixion there, because it *accords with*, although it is not *recorded in*, the written word. (See John xxi. 18.)

with its common practice. But when "the Fathers" of Trent fathered *their own* interpretation upon the Apostle Paul, when they said that *he* "sustains the interpretation" which proceeded from themselves, the double iniquity intensifies the evidence that these Fathers were under the "plenary inspiration" of him who is called "The father of lies."

The Church of Rome is obliged to "sustain the interpretation," that "the kingdom of heaven" means "The Church," for two reasons:—First, without this interpretation she could not sustain the position—that is, the *imposition*—that she is the Church of Christ. Second, without this interpretation she could not sustain the position—that is, the *imposition*—that Peter, who received "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," thereby received the keys of "The Church." With regard to Peter, it is freely granted that he received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, with some specialities; the specialities being, that what was simply *understood* to the rest of the apostles was *expressed* to him; and that he was granted the honourable privilege of *priority* in the use of the keys—keys which simply signified the Old and New Testament revelations, or the power to understand and deliver the message of salvation contained therein.* But the key of "the Church," which is the key of salvation, because it admits to membership with the *saved*, is securely retained by Him "that openeth, and NO MAN shutteth; and shutteth, and NO MAN openeth." (Rev. iii. 7.) We learn that Peter (declaratively) opened the kingdom of heaven, by its keys, on the day of Pentecost, and thereby "added," it does not say to what, 3000 souls. (Acts ii. 41.) But the context shows that he merely added this number to "the kingdom," by the proclamation of its privileges and obligations, and the administration of baptism on their previous *profession* of faith; for Luke immediately after refers admission to the *Church*, not to Peter, but to Peter's Lord. "And the Lord added to the CHURCH daily such (among these 3000, as well as among all others within the kingdom of heaven) as should be *SAVED*." (Acts ii. 47.)

The Vicarious Foundation.—Rome's appeal to Scripture on this head, or on Peter's rockship (if we may use the coinage), brings us face to face, and on fair ground, with the special question of this Tract. The doctrine that Peter is the foundation of the Christian Church, is supported by a confident appeal to one text, and by a corroborative reference to many others, which give prominence to the character and career of the apostle, but, certainly, in no such way as to favour the pretensions of Rome. During the whole of the public ministry of Christ, Peter was under the perpetual influence of a naturally presumptuous temperament, and those stormy passions which became so marvellously hushed when he came to be gifted with the plenitude of Pentecostal grace. His aggravated falls, together with the damaging rebukes which fell from his Lord's lips,

* For a full exposition of the Keys, the writer must refer to a future Tract.

could not but tend to depreciate his character and prejudice his future usefulness as an office-bearer of the Church, if these derogatory causes had not been neutralised by the wisdom of his Divine Master. The more frail any member of the family is, the more it needs the parent's influence to shield him from being injuriously disparaged by the steadier members of the household. Peter, therefore, required a special share of his Master's countenance to dissipate the injurious tendencies of his temper and acts, and the reproofs they incurred, and those distinctions to which Roman Catholics are so fond to appeal as premonstrations of his popedom, were obviously needed to sustain his *equality* among his brethren, instead of being designed to constitute him an apostle of apostles.

By an arrangement peculiar to the wisdom of Providence, the marks of distinction which have been so fatally interpreted were constantly called forth by incidents which made these tokens seasonable, opportune, and almost necessary on the occasions on which they were bestowed. When, for example, Christ had occasion to interrogate His disciples, He usually addressed them collectively. But when all of a number are appealed to, it is not always convenient or fit that all should reply; and as the natural presumption of Peter usually led him to assume the office of spokesman, we can admire the wisdom which permitted this officiousness, and made it subservient to the utility of order. It was thus when Christ said to His disciples, "Whom say ye that I am?" that Peter took upon him to declare for all, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"—a declaration that evoked the celebrated text which Rome says constituted Peter the foundation of the Church, and instituted the doctrine which forms the subject of this Tract; namely—

The Pope's Supremacy, and "The Rock."

THE DOCTRINE STATED.—There can be no need formally to define a doctrine which is now familiar to the world through the teaching of Rome's authoritative standards and doctors, and which has been lately so fully and so explicitly pronounced in

The Pope's Definition of his Supremacy, delivered through Dr Manning.

"I claim to be the SUPREME JUDGE AND DIRECTOR of the consciences of men; of the peasant that tills the field, and the prince that sits on the throne; of the household that sits in the shades of privacy, and the legislature that makes laws for kingdoms. I AM THE SOLE, LAST, AND SUPREME JUDGE OF WHAT IS RIGHT AND WHAT IS WRONG."—*Times*, Oct. 4, 1869.

If this deafening echo of the Vatican thunder fails to shake the nerves of the present generation, it cannot fail to convince it of the present-day lunacy of the Papacy. To issue this frenzied proclamation of the Pope's omniscience in the light of these times, convince-

ingly proves that Rome's right hand has forgot its cunning, and that the judicial Providence which is withering the arm of the Pope's temporal power is also quenching the light of his eye on his spiritual throne. In this twofold retributory Providence are we not witnessing the distinct fulfilment of a prophecy which speaks of a "shepherd" that God would "raise up" in the Christian Dispensation, as He raised up Pharaoh to show His power in the Jewish, and which says of this shepherd, "His RIGHT ARM shall be utterly dried up, and his RIGHT EYE utterly darkened?" (Zech. xi. 17.)

The propositions upon which the Pope would establish his claim to this omniscience (and consequent omnipotence, for "knowledge is power") are summarily two:—

First: That the Apostle Peter was constituted Vicar of Christ and universal Bishop over the Church.

Second: That the Pope is the successor of Peter, both as Vicar and Bishop.

Latterly Dr Manning and others have instituted a "development" of the second proposition—namely, that the Pope is a "Perpetual Peter"—that is, he perpetuates Peter's *person* in the world, and not merely Peter's *office*.—"Centenary of St Peter," 1867, pp. 18, 68, etc.

The first proposition, by which, of course, the second either stands or falls, is the leading question of this Tract, as it alone is professedly found in the letter of the text to which Rome appeals—namely, the first of the four texts quoted at the opening of this Tract, and which four texts are considered under the separate heads which follow:—

First Text or Passage.—The subjoined quotation of this text is paraphrased according to the meaning sustained in these pages:—

Matt. xvi. 16. And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

17. And Jesus answering, said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed (the Christ) unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.

18. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock (which my Father has revealed and thou hast confessed) I will build my church, etc.

ROMISH GLOSS ON THE PASSAGE.—The Douay Bible, in its annotation upon this passage, says,—“Peter is here declared to be the rock upon which the Church was to be built, Christ himself being both the principal founder and the foundation thereof.”

To save appearances, Rome here makes the convenient admission that Christ is the “*principal* foundation,” or rock, of the Church. But we cannot accept an accommodation which is simply an attempt to muffle up, with the *one* foundation of the text, the idea of *another* foundation. The terms of the text totally eliminate the notion of a second or secondary rock in relation to the Church. The text does not say, “Upon *these* rocks,” but “upon *this* rock I will build my church;” so that, whichever or whoever is “this rock,” it must be Christ or Peter *exclusively*. Who is included and who is excluded

is determined by Paul in a correlative text. Paul does not say that Christ is the "principal foundation," but the *only* foundation—"Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is JESUS CHRIST." (1 Cor. iii. 11.)

PETER'S CONFESSION.—That the "Father's" revelation of Christ to Peter was made by enlightening his mind to understand the prophecies of the Old Testament which testified of Christ, there can be little doubt. The Old Testament—that is, the Greek Septuagint version (a translation from the Hebrew made about 300 years before Christ), was then in the hands of the ordinary Jews, else Christ and His Apostles could not have constantly appealed to it, even when addressing the most illiterate of the people; and Paul everywhere "reasoned out of the Scriptures"—that is, these Greek Scriptures, with his Jewish opponents. The Jews of Berea put his teaching to the test, and "searched the scriptures daily, whether these things were so." (Acts xvii. 2, 11.) Peter was a previous disciple of John, the forerunner of Christ; and, with such a master, he must have been *schooling* in those prophecies which concerned Him whose mission John was sent to prepare for and proclaim. These prophecies frequently refer to Christ by the term *Rock*. (Isa. viii. 14; etc.) Hence, whether Peter received the revelation referred to in the text in the way suggested or not, one thing is certain, that the term *Rock* was an inspired and distinctive *title of Christ* ages before Peter received a similar title; and when Peter confessed "the Christ" on this occasion, he but confessed the "Rock of ages," long expectantly confessed in the Jewish Church, and to which Paul refers when he says, "They drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was CHRIST." (1 Cor. x. 4.)

GRAMMAR OF THE PASSAGE.—The ellipsis "the Christ," supplied in the 17th verse, has no corresponding term in the Greek. But as there is *something* here understood, both the Roman Catholic and Protestant Bibles have supplied the word "it," to represent this something. This "it" can only be interpreted of Peter's confession in the doctrinal sense already referred to in the Introduction. But this ellipsis must be rejected as erroneous for the reasons there assigned, as well as for those to be supplied here.

In the Greek, the original language of the New Testament and the language of the Septuagint, there are two words for rock, *Petros* and *Petra*. Our English word Peter, is only a slightly changed form of the first. Using these words for the corresponding English ones, the disputed proposition would read thus:—"Thou art *Petros*, and upon this *Petra* I will build my church." Rome makes these two *different* words, *Petros* and *Petra*, refer to the *same* person, namely, Peter. The first objection that arises against this is, that it opposes an unexceptionable Scripture rule in the application of the two terms—namely, that Peter, whose name occurs scores of times in the New Testament, is elsewhere *always* called *Petros* in the original; while Christ, whenever He receives the title *Rock*, either in the Greek New

Testament or the Septuagint, is *always* called *Petra*. The inference is, that in the present case, as in all others, Petros means *Peter*, and Petra, *Christ*. The circumstance that Petros is a *masculine* word, and Petra a *feminine* noun, need not be adverted to here. Why Christ, though a man, is consistently represented by the feminine noun, will be noticed further on.

The word Christ is represented in the Greek by the word *Kristos*, of which the former is a derivative ; and in representing the respective persons, each of the words, Petros, Petra, and Kristos, is sometimes used *with* and sometimes *without* the Greek article, which we translate by our article "the." In the 16th verse, when Peter says, "Thou art *the* Christ," the article is in the Greek as well as in the English. In the illustrative sentence, "Thou art Petros, and upon this Petra I will build my church," the article is in the Greek before Petra, but *not* before Petros ; although Petros, or Peter's name, as *a rule*, has the article before it throughout the Greek Testament. Hence the illustrative proposition, mended by the required insertion of the article, would read, "Thou art Petros, and upon this, *the* Petra, I will build my church." There can be *no reason whatever assigned* why Petros should here have *no* article, while Petra *has*, except to bring the latter into *apposition* (as grammarians call the predicament of the two words which signify the *same* person or thing) with the antecedent of the preceding verse, "*the* Kristos." The circumstance that Kristos is used *with* the article, required that Petra should be used *with* the article. In other words, *Petra* required to be in grammatical uniform with *Kristos*, to point out that the one represented the other, or that "*the* Petra" stood for "*the* Kristos"—THE ROCK FOR CHRIST.

Next, as the object "revealed" in the 17th verse must be the same as the object confessed in the 16th, it follows, that if "the Petra" represents "the Kristos," as *expressed* in the 16th verse, it must represent the same as *understood* in the 17th ; and that hence the proper ellipsis to be supplied in the latter is not "it," but "the Kristos," or "the Christ," as supplied in the paraphrase.

The Church of Rome being quite sensible that the Greek text is in so many ways against her, seeks one way, and of course a dishonest way, to get out of her difficulties. She alleges (See Note in Rhemish Testament, Douay Bible, etc.,) that Christ did not speak the above passage in Greek, but in *Syriac*, in which language *Cephas*, the term for rock, has not two forms, as the word for rock has in the Greek ; so that in this case, if we use the Syriac word for the two English ones, Christ on the occasion would have said, "Thou art *Cephas*, and upon this *Cephas* I will build my church." Here, of course, as the *same* word is used for the rock in both positions, it might be consistently argued that it represents the *same* person, namely Peter. To corroborate this view, Rome's expositors refer to the text in John, where Christ, anticipating the noble confession made or to be made by Peter, and designing to signalise and reward

the same, said, "Thou shalt be called *Cephas*." (John i. 42.) Now, even *granting* that Christ spoke the disputed sentence in Syriac, if the Holy Spirit (who "takes of the things of Christ, and shows them," or interprets them, John xvi. 14, 15) has, by Matthew and others, recorded the meaning of what Christ said, the record of what He *meant* is even better than if we had the record of what He *said*. Thus, to take the passage to which Rome refers, "Thou shalt be called Cephas;" if we ask, How does the Spirit interpret this "Cephas?" the answer from the Douay Bible is, "which is by interpretation *Peter*"—that is, in the Greek, "which is by interpretation *Petros*," the exclusive name of Peter. Had the Spirit said, "which is by interpretation *Petra*," then "the Petra" of Matthew might be fairly contested in favour of Peter. But as it is, the Holy Spirit has shut the Syrian door, by which Rome would seek to escape with "a lie in her right hand."

The statement that Christ spoke the passage of Matthew in Syriac, is not only a gratuitous assertion, but for many reasons a false one. The Greek language (much provincialised) at the time of the Saviour was more common among the Jews of Judea and elsewhere than the Syriac; and Christ and His apostles quoted from, and reasoned from the Greek Septuagint, *because it was so*. Again, the New Testament was written in Greek, for the people in Judea as well as for others, and if there had not been a competent knowledge of the language among the people the Testament would have been given to them in an "unknown tongue"—a thing which Paul expressly condemns. (1 Cor. xiv.) Further, the apostles and the Jewish writers of the Testament were all, with the exception of Paul and Luke, illiterate men, and although they were inspired to *write* in Greek, they were not inspired to *know* Greek. They wrote in their own (and because their own) very imperfect, and very ungrammatical Greek; and thus we have proof upon proof, that Christ spoke to His apostles and the people, not in the Syriac, but in the provincial Greek, which pervaded Judea at the time. Hence, Rome has here simply resorted to her usual practice of supporting one falsehood by another.

WHY CHRIST IS CALLED PETRA OR "THE PETRA."—The application of the feminine Petra to Christ may appear inconsistent; although it is obvious, that when distinction of *gender* does not mean distinction of *sex*, as is the case with all those names in Greek which in English we call *neuters*, it cannot involve the inconsistency of applying a name really expressive of one sex to a person or thing of the opposite sex. But the case is otherwise explicable. A term may be employed either as a proper name to distinguish a *person*, or as a figurative title to express the *office*, *quality*, or some *relationship* of an individual. Applied in the former capacity, the gender of the word must naturally correspond with the sex of the individual named by it. Applied with the latter object, especially in Scripture, the word having a special reference to the office, quality, etc., sex is overlooked; as when the Church is called a "Virgin," although the great

majority of its members are men and married women. The two words, Petros and Petra, have this distinction as applied respectively to Peter and Christ. Thus, in Matthew's passage, Petros *simply* names Peter's person; whilst Petra signifies not merely a person, but a person fulfilling a certain *function* or *office*—namely, the function or office of supporting the Church. The word Petra being thus directed to the expression of the function of the person, rather than the person himself, ignores the idea of sex; and it is, besides, the *only* word of the two which could properly express the function of support referred to, or denote the idea of a foundation, as we proceed to show.

Willing to allow Popery all the benefit of liberal concessions, the preceding arguments were conducted without taking any advantage of the *material difference* between the meanings of the two words. But it would not be right to close this head of the argument without stating it. Liddell and Scott's well-known standard Lexicon defines the two terms thus:—

“*Petra*. A rock, such as stand out at sea or on the beach. There is no example in good authors of Petra in the sense of Petros, a stone.”

“*Petros*. A piece of rock, a stone, and thus distinguished from Petra.”

From the classical usage of these terms, then, we find that Petros in no proper sense means a rock, but a *detached fragment* of some crag, or else a mere stone; whilst Petra not only signifies a rock, but one of majestic and immovable character, like the granite mass that challenges the fury of the tempest-driven ocean. No wonder, then, that these words are never used as interchangeable terms in the case of Christ and Peter, and that the inspired writer should have been guided to write “Petra” when his pen recorded the Divine fiat, “On this rock I will build my church.”

WHY PETER WAS CALLED “PETROS.”—Every Pope, when he ascends what he calls the “Chair of Peter,” drops his personal or proper name, and assumes an official one, to parody the alleged similar change of Peter's name from Simon to Cephas, “which being interpreted (as we have seen), is PETROS.” We have seen also that this Petros is a purely personal name, and not an official one, in Matt. xvi. 18; that Petra, and not Petros, is the figurative and official term employed to denote the foundation of the Church in that passage, and that this accords with the essential difference in the two terms, as defined by Liddell and Scott, without, of course, any religious object. Petros is applicable as a personal name, but not applicable in the required official sense. It cannot denote a *foundation rock*; while Petra is exactly appropriate to such a sense. Hence, as the *personal* term is everywhere throughout the Scriptures exclusively applied to Peter, and the *official* one to Christ, we have conclusive evidence that Peter was not newly named or rather “surnamed” (Mark iii. 16), as the index of an official position assigned him in the Church. We must, therefore, account for the change of his name on some other principle than the one which Rome seeks to establish.

When Jacob wrestled with the angel at Peniel, the angel changed his name to Israel, in consequence of the act which manifested the strength of his faith (Gen. xxxii. 24–28.) Peter's profession of Christ was not less significant of such a faith. From this example we may easily deduce that Peter's name was changed, not in reference to an *office conferred*, but to an *act performed*.

This act was one in which he *preached* Christ (in Matt. xvi. 16), rather than one in which he merely expressed his personal belief in Christ, as he did elsewhere along with the rest of the apostles. (John vi. 69.) According to Paul, to preach Christ in his office is (declaratively) to lay the foundation of the Church—"As a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation, . . . which is Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. iii. 10, 11.) When Peter professed Christ this was the virtual act he performed. It was a verbal declaration, not of what Peter *believed*, but of what Christ *was*. He preached or declared that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God; and thus, in Paul's sense, he laid the foundation, or the Rock of the Church, before Paul, and before all. In this act, therefore, we have a satisfactory explanation of the reason "why Peter was called Petros," and of the point and play, or the allusive relations of sound and sense between the terms Petros and Petra. Rome would have it that Peter's name was changed to constitute him the foundation of the Church. But Romanism is the Gospel reversed. Peter's name was changed, not because Christ declared *him*, but because Peter declared *Christ*, the foundation of the Church. He was surnamed, as said before, not because of an office conferred, but an act performed—an act in which he proclaimed for the first time the first great truth in Gospel science. To signalise this truth much more than to reward its proclaimer, Simōn was called Cephas, and Cephas was translated into Petros. No name could have been more appropriate and significant in reference to the design of this change, than one having such a cognate relation to that of the object professed, as Petros has to Petra.

The Second Text or Passage.—The text is subjoined, with a portion of its context.

1 Cor. iii. 10. According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master-builder I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon.

11. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ (Greek, Jesus "*the* Christ," the same title by which Peter confessed Him in Matthew's passage, and with which "*the* Petra" of that passage is identified).

The word foundation has many meanings. But as the apostle here speaks of himself as a *builder*, and uses other *building* phraseology, it is evident that his mind was occupied with a conception of the Church under the figure of an artificial building of which he makes Christ the "*foundation*." His image, therefore, is the same, and represents the same object as in Matthew's passage. It adds no

new feature to Matthew's figure ; but it settles conclusively the question of Matthew's foundation—that is, it totally extirpates Peter from the foundation of Matthew's text ; for unless Paul had another house in view than the Church of Christ, then Matthew's "rock" and Paul's "foundation" must be one, and one to the exclusion of all other rocks.

The apostle is here speaking of ministerial functions, and in the exercise of such functions he declares that "other foundation" than Christ "can no man lay"—that is, *preach* or *teach*. It required all the fearless power of perverting the Divine Word possessed by the Papacy, to impose an interpretation on Matthew's passage which necessarily makes Matthew and Paul belie each other. To preach and teach another foundation than that which Paul has "laid," is to preach and teach another Christ ; and as there is no other Christ in Scripture except an antichrist, it follows that when Rome preaches Peter as the foundation, and the Pope preaches himself as successor in that office, Rome puts Peter, and the Pope puts himself, in the position of that antichrist whose name denotes that he was to deny Christ, *by assuming to represent him*. (1 John ii. 22.)

The apostle, however, elsewhere employs the word foundation in *another sense*, and even in a sense which implies a second foundation in the Church ; but such a foundation as still further repulses the pretensions of the Papacy. It will be necessary, therefore, to direct attention here to this new element in the constitution of the figurative Church, whose two foundations we may distinguish by the terms *primary* and *secondary*.

THE PRIMARY FOUNDATION.—Every one knows that in speaking of an artificial building, we call the substratum of earth or rock by the word *foundation*, and that the security of the structure depends upon the solidity of this basis—a fact which Christ forcibly employs to illustrate the necessity of building by faith, not on Peter or on the Pope, but on Himself, in the subjoined passage :—

Luke vi. 47. Whosoever cometh to ME, and heareth my sayings, and doeth them, I will show you to whom he is like : V. 48. He is like a man which built an house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on a rock (Greek *Petra*, the name of Christ) : and when the flood arose, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and could not shake it : for it was founded upon a rock (Greek *Petra*, the name of Christ).

All will recognise that the rock here spoken of corresponds with the substratum, which the architect calls the foundation, when he proposes to erect his edifice. Christ identifies this rock with *Himself* ; which again reiterates the constantly recurring Scripture fact, "that other foundation can no man lay." But while the rock here is a distinct and indispensable foundation of the house, it is easy to see that *another foundation* is also implied in this passage ; for we read that the builder laid a "foundation" upon this rock. Hence it is plain that two foundations are included in the terms of this text ; the primary foundation—the rock or substratum,—and

the secondary basis laid thereon, and whose precise representative meaning in this passage we need not stop to inquire. It is sufficient to know that such a secondary basis belongs to every artificial building; and, used as a type, it will vary in its representative meaning according to the object symbolised. We now proceed to notice more particularly this,—

THE SECONDARY FOUNDATION.—Every building, as it exists in itself, consists, according to technical distinctions, of two comprehensive parts, the *foundation* and the *superstructure*. The foundation is the part of the walls laid in or on the material surface upon which the building is raised, and generally consists of several courses of stones of massier dimensions, especially as regards breadth, than those employed in the superstructure, which embraces the whole remaining portion of the edifice raised upon this underlying basis. Thus, when the inspired penman is referring to *this* foundation in the construction of Solomon's temple, he says, "And the king commanded, and they brought great stones, costly stones, and hewed stones, to lay the FOUNDATION of the house." (1 Kings v. 17.)

Hence, for want of a discriminating vocabulary, we find the same word applied to two different things in building operations—the *natural* foundation, and the *artificial* foundation, common to every edifice. It is evident, however, that although the artificial basis is called a foundation, it contributes no *independent support* to the superstructure; the whole weight and safety, both of the superstructure and the technical basis itself, being sustained by the natural or the ground-foundation. Paul, as "a wise master-builder," in his desire to illustrate accurately the constitution of the Christian Church, was not slow to perceive the apt analogy which existed between this constitution and the constitution of a material edifice; and adopting the similes he found in the latter, he takes care to make illustrative use of both foundations. The one of his Corinthian text has been already sufficiently noticed; it represents Christ, the Rock of the Church. "Upon this rock," Christ said He would build His Church, and, to honour the "apostles and prophets," whose superior spiritual dimensions entitled them to be laid in the edifice of the Church next to Himself, He built them in the secondary basis, which forms the subject of consideration under—

The Third Text or Passage.—The text is reproduced with a verse or two of the context.

Eph. ii. 20. And (ye) are built upon the FOUNDATION OF THE APOSTLES AND PROPHETS, Jesus Christ himself being the CHIEF CORNER-STONE.

21. In whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord:

22. In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.

The reader will here recall to mind the observations made in the Introduction, on the subject of "separated members of figures," and those made on what may be termed *figurative synthesis*, or the prin-

ciple of reducing such dismembered elements to the figurative whole of which they are the natural parts. In this way the imagery of the preceding passage from Ephesians is readily determined to belong to Matthew's metaphor of the Church.

In thus "comparing spiritual things with spiritual" (1 Cor. ii. 13), and combining what has an obvious natural connection, the reader is again guarded against jumbling together figures, or the ideas of figures, which have no such natural relationship. Thus, Dean Alford, in the expository notes of his Greek Testament, on Matthew xvi. 18, brings the metaphor of the Church therein into figurative relationship with another metaphor in Rev. xxi. 14, which speaks of the wall of a city with "twelve foundations, and in (Gr. *on*) them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb." But the two metaphors have no figurative, and consequently no exegetical, relationship whatever. The metaphor in Matthew is a *single edifice*; that in Revelation, a *city*; and their figurative elements are totally distinct and irrelative. The Dean's reference to Revelation is made in these words, alluding to the Apostle Peter:—"He was the first of those foundation-stones (Rev. xxi. 14) on which the living temple of God was built." By this he would imply that the twelve apostles were twelve foundation-stones in the city wall referred to; the fact being that the apostles were no more foundation-stones in the walls of this city than in the walls of Jericho. The "foundations" were certainly *numbered* after the number of the apostles, and the *names* of the apostles were in or on—that is, *written* in or on the foundations, doubtless as an honourable memorial of their prominent labours in the Church. But that is all that can be deduced from the passage, which is even opposed to the Dean's idea of Peter being "the *first*" laid of the apostolic stones, for this passage *equalises* the apostles in every respect.

Paul's Corinthian text, as we have seen, like that of Matthew, refers restrictively to *one* foundation of the Church, "which is Jesus Christ." But, as we have also seen, the Ephesian passage gives expression to another foundation necessarily referable to the same edifice—a foundation including, with Christ, "the apostles and prophets," and in which, therefore, He is but a component part, namely, "the chief corner-stone." The first foundation is a *unity*; the second a *plurality*. In the first Christ is alone; in the second He has associates. There are other stones of which He is a fellow-stone, and other corner-stones of which He is "the chief,"—a chief stone, which the Scripture, as well as the technical builder, distinguishes as the "foundation-stone." (Isa. xxviii. 16.) The reason of its being so called need hardly be alluded to, except to exemplify even the incidental closeness of the analogy which exists between this stone and the person (the *humanity*, as we shall see) of Christ. The foundation-stone is so called because this stone is (though, as a rule, not practically, but theoretically, or ideally,) *the first founded*. However the difference between theory and practice arose here, the correspondence between the type and antitype is not the less noticeable. Christ, the spiritual foundation-stone, though *provisionally* laid "from the foundation of the world," was not *actually* so till the time of His manhood.

The foundation-stone, then, is that designed and prepared to be first laid. If the building is square, or else oblong, like Solomon's Temple, the foundation-stone will be a rectangular block, and a

corner-stone. The foundation-stone of important buildings is usually prepared with particular pains, and laid with formalities by a personage or a person of distinction. Besides the honour thus put upon it, the foundation-stone of an oblong or rectangular building (the most perfect form for an edifice), receives importance from its directive influence in relation to the rest; the bearings of all other stones in the edifice being regulated by the position and bearings of this. Speaking as we are of a perfect edifice, constructed of cut and squared stones, all other stones will be ruled and plumbed in keeping with this fundamental stone. How well, then, it merits the textual title, "The CHIEF corner-stone!"

It remains to remark, that as Paul's Corinthian passage speaks so prohibitively of *one* foundation in the Christian Church, while his Ephesian text develops the existence of another and a very different basement, we should thus have been brought to face a formidable Scripture difficulty, if we had not the key of its solution in the *two distinctive senses* in which the apostle applies the word, and with which we are familiar in the human builder's use of the same term. By this double sense the Scripture typology in the case is seen to be in exact accordance with the constitution of the *material edifice*, which the Scriptures employ as an emblem of the Church; and further, Paul's two passages are reconciled to each other by an exposition which, perhaps, will commend itself from the fact *that these two passages of Scripture cannot be otherwise reconciled.* Other attempted forms of reconciliation have only given birth to such absurdities as those grotesquely *imagined out* in the annexed extract from one of the first commentaries of the day on the same two passages.

"The same stone is at once the corner-stone and the foundation-stone on which the whole building rests. St Paul supposes a stone or rock so large, and so fashioned, as to be both at once supporting the whole as the foundation, and in part rising up at the extremities, so as to admit of the side walls meeting in it, and being united in it, as the corner-stone (!)—ZANCHIUS."—Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown's Commentary (on Eph. ii. 20, compared with 1 Cor. iii. 11, 12). Two Vol. Ed., 1866.

It is needless to waste remark on such a fantastical piece of architecture as that which exegetical experts here ascribe to Paul, the "wise master-builder" of the New Testament Church. Everything here is confusion confounded. The commentator makes the chief "corner-stone" and the "foundation-stone" *two* things, while they are technically *one*. Again, he identifies this "foundation-stone" with the rock, which, in correct architecture, is the ground-foundation that supports the whole building, including the *foundation-stone* as well as the rest. Before, he made two things of one; here, he makes *one* thing of *two*; and the rest of his description is such a fanciful muddle, that if, as he says, Paul is the author of it, he must have taken some abnormal and egregious temple of Buddha to illustrate the Christian Church.

We cannot but see that this and similar commentaries have resulted from a want of attention to the principle of *analogy*, which the Divine Spirit has so much made the expositor of His truth, and which He has employed so appositely in the present case, to illustrate the constitution of the Church. But here, lest the exposition of these pages should be charged with a similar want of analogical consistency, we have to account for an apparent discrepancy which is likely to present itself in this place;—namely,

HOW CAN CHRIST BE “THE ROCK” OF ONE FOUNDATION, AND “THE CHIEF CORNER-STONE” OF THE OTHER?

This question is substantially the same as that with which Christ confounded his Jewish opponents, when He asked them, “What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. How then doth David in spirit call him Lord?” (Matt. xxii. 42, 43.) The priests commissioned to instruct the people about Christ were effectually silenced by a question to which every Protestant child could give a ready answer. Christ, then, as all Scripture testifies, and, as we hold, all *nature* too, has a dual constitution—*divine* and *human*. In His Divine nature He is David’s Lord; in His human nature David’s son, or descendant “after the flesh.” In a parallel passage He is called “The Root and the Offspring of David.” (Rev. xxii. 16.) In His Divine nature, He is “the Root”—the creative principle from which David derived his personal existence, and became a stem of humanity; in His human nature, He is “the Offspring” of David—a scion or branch that sprang from that royal stem. The reader has now an answer to the question, “How can Christ be the rock of one foundation, and the corner-stone of the other?” In His Divine nature, He is “the Rock”—the “Rock of ages”—upon which the Builder has been laying His imperishable stones since the days of “righteous Abel.” In His human nature, He is the “chief corner-stone,” *provisionally* laid (as in another official capacity provisionally “slain”—Rev. xiii. 8) upon the Rock of His divinity, “from the foundation of the world;” *actually* laid thereupon in “the fulness of time.”

Hence in Scripture the term rock is everywhere proper to His *Divine nature*, and not proper to His human; whilst the term stone is proper to His *human nature*, and not proper to His Divine. In the Old Testament, which we speak of first, the term stone is nowhere applied to Christ, except prophetically in relation to His *future humanity*. Thus, Daniel’s “STONE cut out without hands” (Dan. ii. 34), is held by common consent to refer to the birth of His future manhood; the expression “without hands,” being viewed by some (no doubt, truly) to denote the *supernatural* mode of His generation. Again, the conspicuous prophecy of Isaiah (xxviii. 16), in which He is called a “tried STONE,” has a similar necessary and exclusive reference to His manhood; for in this nature only was He “tried.” In this nature only was He “in all points TEMPTED like as

we are, yet without sin." (Heb. iv. 15.) Hence, if the terms rock and stone are both applied to Christ in the Old Testament, and the latter never applied to Him except prophetically in relation to His *humanity*, it will follow that the term rock must be there used exclusively in relation to His *divinity*. A single text is produced to confirm this position. And they all "drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ." (1 Cor. x. 4.) This connection of Christ with the Jewish Church cannot, of course, refer to His manhood, for His manhood had, as yet, no existence. If, therefore, the "spiritual Rock followed" the Jewish camp, and "that Rock was Christ," but not Christ in His *manhood*, it follows as a necessary consequence, that it was Christ in His *divinity* to whom the term Rock is here twice over applied. Illustrations from the New Testament will be supplied further on.

The Jewish priests, unable to understand the bearing of Christ's question on the twofold character of the person of Christ, for this and other reasons deducible therefrom, rejected Him in both natures. In the one, because they conceived His obvious assumption of Divinity was offensively too *high*. Hence the charge of "making himself equal with God." (John v. 18.) In the other, because the *grade* of humanity in which he appeared was contemptuously too *low*. They wanted a Messiah of princely rank, with imperial mien and a conquering sword, and not a "carpenter's son." The prophecies refer to this double rejection of Christ by the use of the terms "rock" and "stone." David having a special sympathy with the rejection of Christ as his descendant, or as *man*, employs the term "stone" exclusively in the following,—

(Matt. xxi. 42, referring to Psa. cxviii. 22.) The **STONE** which the builders rejected, the same is become the head (or chief) of the corner—the "chief corner-stone."

Isaiah makes use of both terms:—

Isa. viii. 14. And he shall be for a sanctuary (that is, to His believing people); but for a **STONE** of stumbling, and for a **ROCK** of offence, to both the houses of Israel.

The same distinction of terms, and consequent distinction of natures, are preserved when such prophecies are referred to in the New Testament.

Rom. ix. 33. As it is written, Behold, I lay in Zion a stumbling-**STONE** and **ROCK** of offence: and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.

1 Pet. ii. 8. And a **STONE** of stumbling, and a **ROCK** of offence, even to them which stumble at the word.

If God says, "I have used *similitudes* by the ministry of the prophets," and if the terms rock and stone applied to Christ are *broadly different* "similitudes," which ought to represent as broadly different counterparts in His person, ought not the teaching of these similitudes to be taken into consideration by the present-day Rationalistic School of Scripture interpreters?—the rational principle of interpretation being, as they say, the principle of judging the

supernatural, or the alleged supernatural, by the *natural*. This principle is here homologated in a passing remark. If, then, Nature reveals to us that every individuality, whether of cause or phenomena, is a *link* in a great concatenated whole; if every such link is a *mean between two extremes*; if every such mean must, from its very function, participate in the *nature* of *both extremes*, as the “zoophyte” in uniting animal and vegetable being,—then, interpreting the supernatural by the natural, whether is it “rational” to believe that the province of being includes a great two-natured personality, that implements the demands of a great law, and *binds creation with its Author*; or, to judge that no such vinculum exists, where above all others a strong bond of connection is needed—that we are living in a universe in which a grand *hiatus* violates the whole of its teaching, and cuts off continuity of being by the absence of a great “missing link?”

Popery itself gives evidence that man has a native yearning for the existence and practical relations of such a link, and the Pope, taking advantage of this desiderated want, professes to supply it in his own person as the Vicar of Christ. If we believe this profession, the Pope, in his person or office, bridges over the yawning gulf which Rationalism makes between heaven and earth, and he offers to all a ready passage from the last to the first, on the condition that we obey him, and pay him the toll on his own side of the bridge. He calls this toll “Peter’s penny,” and he professes to succeed to Peter’s penny because he succeeds to Peter’s office. We have sufficiently proved, however, that the office he ascribes to Peter is just as unscriptural as the pence he exacts. We have fulfilled the command to “search the Scriptures,” and our findings have everywhere been, that Peter is not the Rock of the Christian Church. We subjoin here certain corollaries, which flow from our proofs on the twofold official capacity of Christ in relation to the Church:—

1. As Peter had confessedly but one nature, he could not, like Christ, be simultaneously in *both foundations of the Church*.

2. The secondary or stone-foundation of the Church, according to Paul, is composed of “the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.” Hence, as Peter was an *apostle*, he must be a *stone* in this foundation, and consequently cannot be *the rock beneath*.

3. If Peter, a member of the stone-foundation, is also the rock beneath, then Peter is *built on himself*, which is impossible, as no creature can be either physically or morally self-supported.

4. If Peter, a member of the stone-foundation, is the rock of the other, then Christ, “the chief corner-stone” of the former, is *built upon Peter*—that is, the perfect humanity of Christ (instead of being sustained by His Godhead) is placed in a state of moral dependence upon the crazy humanity of Peter.

5. As the rock which supports a building is no part of the building (and hence Christ in His *divinity* is no part of the Church), if

Peter is the rock which supports the Church, he cannot be a *member of the Church*.

Such is the progeny of fallacies and absurdities that spring from the one great parent falsehood, fabricated out of the misrepresented text, which we trust has been so illustrated as to demolish the rock, and, consequently, the superstructure of the Papacy.

The Fourth Text or Passage.—The text, as before, is quoted, with a considerable context.

1 Pet. ii. 2. As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby :

3. If so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious.

4. To whom coming, as unto a LIVING STONE, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious,

5. Ye also, as LIVELY (Greek, LIVING) STONES, are built up a SPIRITUAL HOUSE, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.

6. Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture, Behold, I lay in Zion a CHIEF CORNER-STONE, elect, precious : and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded.


Peter here reproduces a reference to the “chief corner-stone” of Paul’s “holy temple.” He thus supplies direct data for identifying his own “spiritual house” with Paul’s, and, consequently, with the metaphorical edifice of Matthew. Peter makes a bold and beautiful addition to the imagery of his predecessors, and brings the metaphor of the Church to perfection by *vitalising* the materials of the building, or converting its stones into “*living* stones,” and a temple of life. Although his passage is last in the order of consideration here, it associates the earliest process employed by the builder in the construction of his edifice. Hence Peter’s address here is to “*new-born* babes ;” not merely babes, but babes just born. Changing the figure, as he does, he would be addressing living stones just new from the quarry. The first practical procedure of every builder is to get and prepare the stones of his edifice. Christ follows the general rule, and detaches from the quarry of nature the irregular and shapeless materials, which He proceeds to chisel, and shape, and polish, by the hand of His Providence, until they are fitted for a place in His temple. In the quarry of nature they were *dead* as well as deformed ; but the moment the Builder selects and separates any individual stone, it then becomes, by touch and contact with the hand of the Divine Founder, a “*living* stone”—a regenerated member of the great saved sanctuary. According to Popery, no stone can be vitalised except by union with the Church. According to Peter’s process, no stone can be united to the Church until it is vitalised. It cannot be laid in the walls, or even bear to be chipped into shape for that object, until its pores are opened, and softened, and permeated, by the life-giving influx of the life-giving Spirit. Rome, to accommodate the Scriptures to her own heterogeneous fabric, says, “The Church includes the good and the bad.” The hewn stones are built together with deformed crags ; the masonry is constructed of polished stones

and the *debris* of the quarry ; Peter's *living* walls are interworked with *dead* materials. Popery, but not Paul, says these are "FITLY framed together." (Eph. ii. 21.) The Scripture knows no such "Catholic" Church as this. The Church of Christ is *homogeneous* through and through. Every stone in the edifice is purchased by His blood, cemented by His Spirit, and sealed by the same. Every stone is named, and the name is written in "the book of life." (Phil. iv. 3.)

Peter, bending his imagery to the wants of his thought, describes his "spiritual house" as "an holy priesthood." Every member, therefore, is at once a stone in the temple and a priest in the same. The house is the presence-chamber of its princely Founder, and its living stones are all priested to offer up spiritual offerings,—the sacrifice of prayer, the incense of praise, and the grateful tones of thanks inexpressible.

We have now brought to a conclusion this series of remarks on the galaxy of brilliant and forcible similes in which the Scriptures adumbrate the constitution and characteristics of the Divine temple, of which Christ is at once both the Rock and the Builder. The building waits to be finished. The Builder has "laid its foundation with sapphires." Upon these, again, he has erected a multitude of Peter's "living stones." But stones in abundance have yet to come to the hands of the Artist. When these, His "elect" materials, are all found ; when the quarry of nature has been fully explored and depleted ; when the walls of the edifice are topped with its last tiers, and ere yet the earthly scaffolding by which it has been erected is demolished with fire, "He shall bring forth the head-stone thereof with shoutings, crying, Grace, grace unto it !" (Zech. iv. 7.)

EDINBURGH, *January* 1870.

 See Tracts already issued on—

"Transubstantiation and 'The Mass.'"

"Transubstantiation and 'The Eucharist.'"

Also the Companion Tracts of the present one, on

"The Pope's Supremacy and 'The Keys.'"

"The Pope's Supremacy and 'The Crozier.'"

YOUNG & CO., 14 NICOLSON SQUARE, EDINBURGH,

PUBLISHERS OF

"*Biblical Notes and Queries*;" *A Monthly Periodical for the "Real Study of the Bible."*

C. GIBSON, PRINTER, THISTLE STREET, EDINBURGH.

